

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 5-16 and 18-20 remain pending in the application, as claims 4, 17 and 21 have been canceled without prejudice. In the Office Action, claim 17 was objected to because of an informality. Claim 17 has been canceled, and the subject matter of this claim has been incorporated into independent claim 11. Amended claim 11 contains the correct spelling of the term "least." In addition, claims 1-3 and 5-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have added a hardware limitation to independent claim 1 and request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Also in the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5, 6, 10-13, 15, 16 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0131135 to Yun (Yun I) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,510,465 to Bilansky, et al. (Bilansky). Claims 7-9, 14, 17, 18, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yun in view of Bilansky and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0115358 (Yun II).

Independent claim 1 recites the limitation that the IPC stack includes a presentation manager. As noted in the application, a presentation manager may be used to translate different data types between different system components, such as software threads (see page 6, lines 18-19). Yun I clearly explains that the system of Yun I does not include a presentation mechanism because the unified interprocess communication (UIPC) aims for real-time protocol (see paragraph 0074). Indeed, the Examiner agrees with this statement (see page 3 of the Office Action of May 13, 2008). Because it expressly prohibits the use of a presentation manager, Yun I clearly

teaches away from incorporating such a component in its UIPC system. As such, Applicants request that this 103 rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 7 includes the limitation that the session manager adds a command header to data sent by the component that causes the port to perform a certain co-processing task to the data prior to the data being sent from the port. The Examiner agrees that neither Yun I nor Bilansky teach this limitation (see page 9 of the Office Action of May 13, 2008). To reject this claim, however, the Examiner cites several passages in Yun II (see paragraphs 0135 and 0120). But neither of these descriptions mentions anything about a command header that would cause a port to perform a co-processing task on data being sent from the port. In fact, the material of paragraph 0135 of Yun II simply describes information that is commonly found in message headers of a network layer, which, as one of skill in the art would appreciate, has nothing to do with co-processing.

Independent claim 11 has been amended by incorporating the subject matter of dependent claim 7 therein. For the reasons described above, neither Yun I, Yun II nor Bilansky teach this limitation. Moreover, independent claim 19 has been amended by clarifying that the Service ID is located in a co-processor command block (from dependent claim 21). Again, none of the cited references teach anything about co-processor command blocks, as one of skill in the art would appreciate.

As such, Applicants submit that the above claims are patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested. Passing of this case is now believed to be in order, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any necessary fee, or credit any overpayment, to Motorola, Inc. Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 24, 2008

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
1303 East Algonquin Road
IL01/3RD
Schaumburg, IL 60196

Customer Number: 24273

By: /Larry G. Brown/
Larry G. Brown

Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 45,834

Tel: 954-723-4295 direct line
Tel: 954-723-6449 main line
Fax No.: (847) 576-3750

E-mail: docketing.us@motorola.com